IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR

THURSDAY, THE 8TH MARCH 2007 / 17TH PHALGUNA 1928

Con.Case(C).No. 399 of 2007(S)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT/ORDER IN WPC.205/2007 Dated 03/01/2007

.....

: PETITIONER

M/S.C.D.CHACKU & CO.,
REPRESENTED BY ITS PARTNER, C.C.NIXON,
CHAVAKKAD, S/O. C.D.CHACKU, AGED 28 YEARS,
CHIRIYANKANDATH HOUSE, THIRUNELLUR.

BY ADV. SRI.K.I.MAYANKUTTY MATHER
SMT.S.LAKSHMY

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. DR.M.BEENA, AGED AND FATHER'S NAME
NOT KNOWN, DISTRICT COLLECTOR, TRICHUR.

2. V.ARCHIDEL, AGED AND FATHER'S NAME
NOT KNOWN, DISTRICT SUPPLY OFFICER, TRICHUR.

BY ADV. SHRI.C.K.GOVINDAN, GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 08/03/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR, J.

COC No. 399 of 2007

Dated, this the 8th day of March, 2007

J U D G M E N T

This contempt petition is filed on the ground that petitioner was not heard in adjudication proceedings inspite of specific direction in the judgment. Even though there is technical violation of judgment, there is no scope for initiation of contempt action because the finding is that the rice seized was not to be sold in the open market but was intended for distribution through Public Distribution System and therefore hearing in this case is only an empty formality. Accordingly contempt is closed leaving freedom to the petitioner to challenge fresh order passed pursuant to judgment if there is any tenable ground.

(C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR, JUDGE.)

jg